

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Bottomley
Greg Lambright
Dan Maldonado
Scott Marble

MEMBERS ABSENT

Craig Boswell (excused)
Wendy LeSueur (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Mia Lozano
Angelica Guevara
Debbie Archuleta

Larry Davis
Dale Johnson
Jason Davis
Others

A. Call to Order:

Acting Chair Tom Bottomley called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the August 4, 2010 Meeting:

On a motion by Greg Lambright seconded by Dan Maldonado the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

C. Discuss, receive comment and take action on the following appeals of Administrative Design Review:

1. 756 West Southern. (Council District 3) Appeal of staff denial for signage on an existing gas station/convenience store.

Staff member Mia Lozano explained the application was for signage which does not meet the Sign Ordinance design standards, and far exceeds the allowable size for signage. She stated the red and yellow stripes are considered corporate banding. She stated the building had been painted by a previous owner. Staff member Angelica Guevara explained that if the Design Review Board did not determine the red and yellow were architectural elements the applicant could apply for a Special Use Permit for a Comprehensive Sign Plan through the Board of Adjustment.

Acting Chair Tom Bottomley confirmed the building was not part of a shopping center.

Boardmember Greg Lambright stated the changes were a real departure from the original building. He did not think the changes were attractive. He thought the white was too stark, and the whole thing was signage. He supported staff's decision.

Boardmember Dan Maldonado stated it was a very simplistic building. This was signage without any improvement. The color placement did not respect the building. He supported staff.

Boardmember Scott Marble agreed with staff. He thought the colors really jumped out at you and were very bright. The revisions had no respect for the building.

Larry Davis, Shell Distributor; Dale Johnson, Signs +; and Jason Davis, Marketing Manager of Distribution, represented the case. Larry Davis stated they put together a Shell station that meets Shell requirements. Mr. Davis stated the building had been repainted twice since the original Texaco Starmart. He stated that West Mesa needs major brands to build up the area. People needed to know this was a Shell station. He did not want to "hide/camouflage" the corporate branding. He stated the owner wanted to replace the chain link fencing, with wrought iron. Mr. Davis stated we would be willing to reduce the yellow and red on the building if they were allowed to revise the gas canopy as proposed.

Boardmember Bottomley stated the form of the building was very clean line form. He thought the white was very stark. He did not like the use of the stripes. He suggested the colors be incorporated into the form of the building. He stated the red and yellow stripes needed to meet Sign Ordinance requirements for size. He confirmed the red band is lighted and the rest is vinyl. Mr. Bottomley confirmed with staff that the applicant would be allowed 160 sq. ft. of signage on two sides.

Mr. Davis stated the canopy elevations along Southern and Extension would be lighted. He asked if they could use just the red, on two sides of the canopy.

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Boardmember Greg Lambright stated there was a reason for the placement of the bands on the original building. He suggested the building be tan and red, with the red used where the blue was on the original building. May use gray and red, or gray and yellow. He stated one color needed to be worked into the architecture of the building. He stated Mesa has the most liberal Sign Code in the Valley, he was sure the applicants could work out an agreement for signage. He stated the original columns on the gas canopy were 24" round, not the 12" square that exist now. He stated if the applicants used one color and incorporated it into the architecture, it could be approvable. He stated this was not architecture; it was slapped onto the building. He wanted the canopy to be dimensional. He stated the columns should be something, possibly clad in block or some other material.

Boardmember Bottomley stated that just because they are using corporate colors did not mean they have to use every corporate color. Use one color. This looks tacked on. He stated every site deserves some architecture. "You need to raise the standard."

Mr. Davis stated that Shell would not allow the suggested changes for an in-fill site, and would leave the whole building white.

Boardmember Bottomley stated they don't need to redesign the whole building; they need to work with the architecture that is already there. He said they needed to choose one accent color, and work with the building not against it. He confirmed the applicant intends to wrap the monument sign in cladding. He also confirmed with staff that the applicant would need to replace any dead or dying landscaping.

It was moved by Boardmember Greg Lambright and seconded by Boardmember Scott Marble that the case be continued to the October 6, 2010 Design Review Meeting with the understanding that the project could be approved by staff, if they determine that the resubmittal meets the Design Guidelines.

Vote: Passed 4 – 0

G. Other business:

None

H. Adjournment:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da